

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated January 23, 2008. Claims 1-58 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 12, 18, 24, 28, 39, 50, and 51 being in independent form. By the present Amendment, claims 1, 12, 18, 24, 28, 39, 50 and 51 have been amended. It is submitted that no new matter has been added and no new issues have been raised by the present Amendment.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's determination that claims 31, 33-36, 42, 44-47, 54, 55, 56, and 58 represent allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,632 (Irrinki). Claims 12-15, 18-21, 28, 32, 39, 43, 50, 51, and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Irrinki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,710,550 (Hseih). Claims 16, 17, 22, 23, 37, 38, 48, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Irrinki in view of Hseih and U.S. Patent No. 5,361,232 (Petschauer). Claims 24-27, 29, 40, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Irrinki in view of Hseih and U.S. Patent No. 4,173,029 (Rabindran). Claims 30, 41, and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Irrinki in view of Hseih, Rabindran and Microsoft Computer Dictionary, fifth edition (Dictionary).

In independent claims 1 and 50, as amended, during a test operation mode, power is supplied to the memory cells selected for testing and power is cut off to the memory cells not selected for testing. Then, standby current of the memory cells selected for testing is measured

while in the test operation mode. Accordingly, the selected memory cells may be tested for standby current failure.

The Examiner contends that Irrinki teaches cutting off power to the remaining memory cells because Irrinki, at column 9, lines 26-61, relates to blowing fuses to individual rows and columns. However, the cited portions of Irrinki, best illustrated at Step 550, Figure 5, relates to blowing fuses to individual rows and columns for those memory cells that **have already been tested and have been determined to be failing cells**. By blowing the fuses to the failing cells, the “failures that may only exist under a particular set of operating conditions” are converted to “functional failures.” In a sense, Irrinki performs a stress test on the cells and those cells that fail the stress test are cut off by blowing the respective fuses so that weak cells do not fail later on.

Because **Irrinki cuts power to only failing memory cells**, Irrinki teaches away from cutting off power only to those cells not selected for testing and supplying power only to those cells selected for testing, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 50. Accordingly, Irrinki fails to teach or suggest a “supplying a power voltage to the memory cells selected for testing in the test operation mode” and “cutting off power to remaining memory cells not selected for testing in the test operation mode.”

Moreover, Irrinki fails to teach or suggest a “measuring standby current of the memory cells selected for testing while in the test operation mode” as claimed in independent claims 1 and 50. The remainder of the cited art also fails to teach or suggest this feature and the Office Action does not contend that it does.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 50 are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least the above reasons. Additionally, dependent claims 2-11 are patentably distinct from the

cited art at least owing to their dependence upon independent claim 1 and dependent claims 52-56 and 58 are patentably distinct from the cited art at least owing to their dependence upon independent claim 50.

In independent claims 12, 18 and 24, as amended, “power is cut off from the memory cells not selected for testing.” This is fundamentally distinct from Irrinki where power is cut off from those cells determined to have failed. Thus Irrinki fails to teach or suggest that power is cut off from the memory cells not selected for testing, for example, as described above. The remainder of the cited art also fails to teach or suggest this feature and the Office Action does not contend that it does. Accordingly, independent claims 12, 18, and 24 are patentably distinct from the cited art. Similarly, dependent claims 13-17, 19-23, and 25-27 are patentably distinct from the cited art at least owing to their dependence upon claims 12, 18, and 24, respectively.

In independent claims 28 and 39, as amended, “power is cut off from the rows of memory cells not selected for testing.” This is fundamentally distinct from Irrinki where power is cut off from those cells determined to have failed. Thus Irrinki fails to teach or suggest that power is cut off from the rows of memory cells not selected for testing, for example, as described above. The remainder of the cited art also fails to teach or suggest this feature and the Office Action does not contend that it does. Accordingly, independent claims 28, and 39 are patentably distinct from the cited art. Similarly, dependent claims 29-38 and 40-49 are patentably distinct from the cited art at least owing to their dependence upon claims 28 and 39, respectively.

In independent claim 51 as amended, “power is cut off from the repair units of memory cells not selected for testing.” This is fundamentally distinct from Irrinki where power is cut off from those cells determined to have failed. Thus Irrinki fails to teach or suggest that power is cut

off from the repair units of memory cells not selected for testing, for example, as described above. The remainder of the cited art also fails to teach or suggest this feature and the Office Action does not contend that it does. Accordingly, independent claim 51 is patentably distinct from the cited art. Similarly, dependent claim 57 is patentably distinct from the cited art at least owing to its dependence upon claim 51.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

3/20/2008



Joseph B. Gross
Reg. No. 57,109
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888 telephone
(516) 692-8889 facsimile